

REMARKS

1. General

Claims 1 – 5 and 7 – 10 are pending in the Application. The Examiner has rejected Claims 1 – 5 and 7 – 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee (U.S. Patent No. 6,302,421) in view of Henriksson (U.S. Patent No. 5,279,180). The Examiner has alternately rejected Claims 2 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee (U.S. Patent No. 6,302,421) in view of Henriksson (U.S. Patent No. 5,279,180 and further in view of Chiu (U.S. Patent No. 6,402,166). Applicant has cancelled Claims 2 and 5 – 9 (and has integrated the limitations therein into Claim 1), and submits the following arguments in support of the amended claims.

2. Response on Rejection of Claims 1 – 5 and 7 – 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1 – 5 and 7 – 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Henriksson. Applicant has cancelled Claims 2 and 5 – 9 and has incorporated most of the limitations therein into Claim 1. Amended Claim 1 is now directed to the embodiment of the present invention that involves the “on-the-fly” insertion of the pin into the aperture in a manner that holds the caster wheel in a fixed orientation through operation of the mechanically linked remote release mechanism. The spring in this embodiment preferences the pin out of the aperture and the mechanical linkage works against the force of the spring. This embodiment of the invention is neither disclosed nor taught by the references cited.

Lee discloses a “locally” set pin that normally resides in the aperture and must be removed by hand force against the spring. No suggestion of a remotely operated insertion of the pin is made. In general, the reference contemplates only the normal positioning of the pin in the aperture (to fix the caster) and the intermittent removal of the pin. The present invention, on the other hand solves the problem of intermittently inserting the pin to fix the caster while the stroller is in motion. The user of the present invention would take such action “on-the-fly” because of the jogging aspect of

the device. That is, the user of the stroller in the present case is likely to desire the flexibility of a freely rotating caster until rough terrain is encountered when a temporary fixing of the caster might be desired. The cited references do not address this problem and do not in combination suggest the solution provided by the present invention as claimed in amended Claim 1.

3. Response on Rejection of Claims 1 – 5 and 7 - 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

The Examiner has alternately rejected Claims 2 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee (U.S. Patent No. 6,302,421) in view of Henriksson (U.S. Patent No. 5,279,180 and further in view of Chiu (U.S. Patent No. 6,402,166). Applicant has cancelled Claims 2 and 8.

SUMMARY/CONCLUSION

Applicant now respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims previously rejected and their passage to allowance. Should any further impediments to allowance remain, Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney at the indicated phone number.

Respectfully submitted,

KAMMER BROWNING PLLC
7700 Broadway, Suite 202
San Antonio, TX 78209
(210) 832-0900
(210) 832-0901 (Fax)

ATTORNEYS FOR APPLICANT

By: 
MARK A. KAMMER, Reg. No. 34,197

Date: 12/27/2005